Missouri Attorney General's Opinions - 2011

Opinion	Date	Topic	Summary
1-2011	Jan 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition (version C) submitted by Ron Calzone to amend Chapter 116, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
2-2011	Jan 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 1.
3-2011	Jan 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 2.
4-2011	Jan 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 1.
5-2011	Jan 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, version 2.
6-2011	Jan 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
7-2011	Jan 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
8-2011	Jan 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
9-2011	Jan 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
10-2011	Jan 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna to amend Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
11-2011	Jan 19	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Ron Calzone amending Chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri (version C).

12-2011	Jan 21	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Ron Calzone (version C) regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 116, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
13-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1a).
14-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2a).
15-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 3a).
16-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 4a).
17-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 5a).
18-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 6a).
19-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 7a).
20-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 8a).
21-2011	Jan 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 9a).
22-2011	Feb 2	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
23-2011	Feb 2	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna to amend Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
24-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna to amend Chapter 115, Revised

			Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
25-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis (version 2) amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution.
26-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 3) amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution.
27-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 4) amending Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution.
28-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 2) amending Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
29-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
30-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
31-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
32-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
33-2011	Feb 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
34-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1a).
35-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2a).
36-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger

			pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 3a).
37-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 4a).
38-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 5a).
39-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 6a).
40-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 7a).
41-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 8a).
42-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 9a).
43-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
44-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
45-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
46-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).

47-2011	Feb 16	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
48-2011	Feb 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna pertaining to a proposed amendment to Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
49-2011	Feb 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
50-2011	Feb 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
<u>51-2011</u>	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1a).
<u>52-2011</u>	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2a).
53-2011	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 3a).
54-2011	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 4a).
<u>55-2011</u>	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 5a).
56-2011	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 6a).
57-2011	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 7a).
58-2011	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 8a).

59-2011	Feb 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 9a).
60-2011	Feb 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
61-2011	Feb 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
62-2011	Feb 28	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown to consolidate Riverview, Missouri with Bellefontaine Neighbors, Missouri.
63-2011	Mar 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
64-2011	Mar 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
65-2011	Mar 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
66-2011	Mar 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
67-2011	Mar 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
68-2011	Mar 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis pertaining to a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
69-2011	Mar 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis to amend Chapter 130, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
70-2011	Mar 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
71-2011	Mar 11	INITIATIVE PETITION.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative

	Mar 11 Mar 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative
73-2011	Mar 11		petition submitted by James B. Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
		INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
74-2011	Mar 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch amending Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
75-2011	Mar 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
76-2011	Mar 21	COMPENSATION. INCREASE IN COMPENSATION. PROSECUTING ATTORNEY. SALARIES FOR PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE. SALARY INCREASE.	Under § 56.265, RSMo 2000, a prosecutor in a non-chartered county must be given the same pay increases provided to associate circuit judges, even if it results in a midterm increase in salary, because the increases are provided pursuant to a formula that existed before the prosecutor was elected, and the prosecutor has no power to control the fixing of judicial salaries.
77-2011	Mar 31	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis amending Chapter 130 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri.
78-2011	Mar 31	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 130 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri.
79-2011	Apr 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
80-2011	Apr 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
81-2011	Apr 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Michael Moore regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 590, Revised Statutes of Missouri.

82-2011	May 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
83-2011	May 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
84-2011	May 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Michael Moore amending Chapter 590, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
85-2011	May 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
86-2011	May 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
87-2011	May 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Michael Moore regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 590, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
88-2011	May 20	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
89-2011	May 31	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
90-2011	May 31	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
91-2011	May 31	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
92-2011	May 31	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
93-2011	June 3	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 7).
94-2011	June 3	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams to amend Article III of the Missouri

			Constitution (version 8).
<u>95-2011</u>	June 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
<u>96-2011</u>	June 10	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
97-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
98-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
99-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
100-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
101-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown to amend Section 321.030, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
102-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
103-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 4).
104-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
105-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
106-2011	June 17	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown to amend Section 321.506, Revised Statutes of Missouri.

107-2011	June 23	JOINT RESOLUTIONS.	Review and approval of legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared pursuant to § 116.175, RSMo, concerning a proposed constitutional amendment passed by the Missouri General Assembly (Senate Joint Resolution No. 2) relating to elections.
108-2011	June 23	JOINT RESOLUTIONS.	Review and approval of legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared pursuant to § 116.175, RSMo, concerning a proposed constitutional amendment passed by the Missouri General Assembly (House Joint Resolution No. 2) relating to the right to pray.
109-2011	June 24	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 7).
110-2011	June 24	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams amending Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 8).
111-2011	June 24	FAIR BALLOT LANGUAGE. JOINT RESOLUTIONS.	Review and approval of legal content and form of a fair ballot language prepared pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, concerning a proposed constitutional amendment passed by the Missouri General Assembly (Senate Joint Resolution No. 2) relating to elections.
112-2011	June 24	FAIR BALLOT LANGUAGE. JOINT RESOLUTIONS.	Review and approval of legal content and form of a fair ballot language prepared pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, concerning a proposed constitutional amendment passed by the Missouri General Assembly (House Joint Resolution No. 2) relating to the right to pray.
113-2011	June 24	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 7).
114-2011	June 24	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 8).
115-2011	July 18	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by James Bryan to amend Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
116-2011	July 26	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Kyle Neale to amend Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
117-2011	Aug 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by James Bryan amending Chapters 376 & 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).

118-2011	Aug 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown to declare SB 308 unconstitutional.
119-2011	Aug 8	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by James Bryan regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
120-2011	Aug 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Kyle Neale amending Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
121-2011	Aug 15	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Kyle Neale regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
122-2011	Aug 24	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 10).
123-2011	Aug 24	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 11).
124-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 10).
125-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 11).
126-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
127-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Chapters 105, 195, and 263, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
128-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown to dissolve the Metropolitan Sewer District St. Louis.
129-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger

			amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 10).
130-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 11).
131-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 12).
132-2011	Sept 23	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 13).
133-2011	Sept 26	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution.
134-2011	Sept 29	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
135-2011	Oct 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 12).
136-2011	Oct 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 13).
137-2011	Oct 5	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown to establishing a community chapter.
138-2011	Oct 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 12).
139-2011	Oct 11	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 13).
140-2011	Oct 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Article IV, Missouri Constitution (version 3).
141-2011	Oct 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets to amend Chapters 105, 195, and 263, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).

142-2011	Oct 13	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution.
143-2011	Oct 14	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Christopher Grant to amend Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 1).
144-2011	Oct 14	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Christopher Grant to amend Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
145-2011	Oct 14	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution.
146-2011	Oct 14	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess amending Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
147-2011	Oct 21	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
148-2011	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets amending Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
149-2011	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets amending Chapters 105, 195, and 263, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
150-2011	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Christopher Grant amending Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 1).
151-2011	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Christopher Grant amending Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
152-2011	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets regarding a proposed amendment to Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
153-2011	Nov 4 Revised Nov 7	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 105, 195, and 263, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).

154-2011	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Christopher N. Grant regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 1).
155-2011	Nov 4	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Christopher N. Grant regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
156-2011	Nov 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Kenny Newhouse.
157-2011	Nov 25	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Chapters 84, 86, and 105, RSMo (version 7).
158-2011	Nov 28	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
159-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger to amend Chapters 84, 86, and 105, RSMo (version 7).
160-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 2).
161-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 3).
162-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 4).
163-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 5).
164-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 6).
165-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 7).
166-2011	Dec 6	INITIATIVE PETITION.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative

		INITIATIVES.	petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 8).
167-2011	Dec 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and rejection of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown.
168-2011	Dec 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Article X, Missouri Constitution (version 9).
169-2011	Dec 12	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger amending Chapters 84, 86, and 105, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 7).
170-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
171-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess amending Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
172-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 84, 86, and 105, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 7).
173-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 1).
174-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2).
175-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3).
176-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 4).
177-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri.
178-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading

			amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
179-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
180-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
181-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
182-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
183-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).
184-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 7).
185-2011	Dec 22	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of the legal content and form of a fiscal note summary prepared for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading amending Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 8).
186-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1).
187-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2).
188-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 3).
189-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 5).
190-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 6).

191-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 7).
192-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed amendment to Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 8).
193-2011	Dec 27	INITIATIVE PETITION. INITIATIVES.	Review and approval of a summary statement prepared for the initiative petition submitted by Paul C. Wilson regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 393 and 386, Revised Statutes of Missouri.



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 5, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 1-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 27, 2010, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Ron Calzone (version C).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 7, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 2-2011

The Honorable Susan Montee Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Montee:

This office received your letter of January 6, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 1). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated state government entities would incur unknown potential litigation costs and local governments would incur costs of at least \$1,256,256 (one-time costs of \$676,800 and ongoing costs for each federal election of \$579,456). Those costs may fluctuate depending on the compensation, staffing and planning decisions of election authorities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 7, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 3-2011

The Honorable Susan Montee Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Montee:

This office received your letter of January 6, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated state government entities would incur unknown potential litigation costs and local governments would incur costs of at least \$1,256,256 (one-time costs of \$676,800 and ongoing costs for each federal election of \$579,456). Those costs may fluctuate depending on the compensation, staffing and planning decisions of election authorities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 7, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 4-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 1) regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow early voting prior to federal general elections and include certain procedures relating to voter identification affidavits, voting address updates, and provisional ballots?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (578) 751-3321

January 7, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 5-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 2) regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow early voting prior to federal general elections and include certain procedures relating to voter identification affidavits, voting address updates, and provisional ballots?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 6-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Russell Purvis (version 1).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 7-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Russell Purvis (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTEI



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 8-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Matt Cologna (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTEI



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 9-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Matt Cologna (version 4).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 10-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri, submitted by Matt Cologna (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTEI



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (578) 751-3321

January 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 11-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of January 10, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Ron Calzone (version C). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State government would incur estimated costs of up to \$76,000 and could incur other unknown potential litigation costs. Local election authorities could incur estimated costs exceeding \$1 million if ballot reprinting would be necessary.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 21, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 12-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 14, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Ron Calzone regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri (version C). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to modify procedures regarding initiative and referendum petitions including counting signatures that are not in compliance with current state laws, creating additional petition circulation offenses, and establishing court deadlines for certain legal challenges?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 13-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 1a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 14-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 2a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 15-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 3a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 16-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 4a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 17-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 5a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 18-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 6a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 19-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 7a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 20-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 8a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

January 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 21-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 9a).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 22-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 24, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Russell Purvis (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 23-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 24, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri, submitted by Matt Cologna (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 24-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of January 26, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis (version 1). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual estimated savings to state government would be at least \$4.7 million. No fiscal impact is expected for local governments.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (578) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 25-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of January 26, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual estimated savings to state government would be at least \$4.7 million. No fiscal impact is expected for local governments.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 -(573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 26-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of January 26, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated state government entities would incur unknown potential costs and local governments would incur costs of at least \$1,256,256 (one-time costs of \$676,800 and on-going costs for each federal election of \$579,456). Those costs may fluctuate depending on the compensation, staffing and planning decisions of election authorities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 27-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of January 26, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 4). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated state government entities would incur unknown potential costs and local governments would incur costs of at least \$1,256,256 (one-time costs of \$676,800 and on-going costs for each federal election of \$579,456). Those costs may fluctuate depending on the compensation, staffing and planning decisions of election authorities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 28-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of January 26, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated state government entities would reimburse election authorities for incurred costs of at least \$974,016 in fiscal year 2015 (one-time costs of \$676,800 and on-going costs for each federal election of \$297,216). Those costs may be higher depending on the compensation, staffing and planning decisions of affected election authorities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 29-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 28, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 1). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to reduce the number of members and districts of the Missouri House of Representatives from 163 to 103 beginning with the 2023 General Assembly?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 30-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 28, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed amendment to Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 2). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to reduce the number of members and districts of the Missouri House of Representatives from 163 to 103 beginning with the 2023 General Assembly?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 31-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 28, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow early voting prior to federal general elections and include certain procedures relating to voter identification affidavits, voting address updates, and provisional ballots?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 32-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 28, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Article VIII of the Missouri Constitution (version 4). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow early voting prior to federal general elections and include certain procedures relating to voter identification affidavits, voting address updates, and provisional ballots?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 33-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated January 28, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to expand options for voters by allowing them to cast ballots in person prior to federal general elections without the current absentee ballot excuse requirement?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 34-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 1a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 35-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 2a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 36-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 3a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 37-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 4a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 38-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 5a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 39-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 6a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 40-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 7a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 41-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 8a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 42-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 9a). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The total cost, savings, and/or change in tax revenue to state and local governmental entities cannot be determined. The proposal (1) requires a range of legislative action with unknown outcomes, and (2) will result in changes to consumer spending patterns that cannot be presently quantified.

Under § 116.175.4, "[t]he attorney general shall ... approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary." You have concluded that you "cannot ... determine []" the "estimated cost or savings, if any, to state or local governmental entities." The form of the fiscal note summary is approved. In the absence of any case law precedent requiring you to state the measure's estimated costs or savings when you determine that it is not possible to do so, we also approve the legal content of your summary.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 43-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 7, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 44-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 7, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 45-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 7, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 4).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 46-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 7, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 5).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 47-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 7, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 6).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 48-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 10, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Matt Cologna (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated state government entities would reimburse election authorities for incurred costs of at least \$974,016 in fiscal year 2015 (one-time costs of \$676,800 and on-going costs for each federal election of \$297,216). Those costs may be higher depending on the compensation, staffing and planning decisions of affected election authorities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 49-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 10, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual estimated savings to state government would be at least \$4.7 million. No fiscal impact is expected for local governments.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 50-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 10, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Russell Purvis (version 5).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 51-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate income, earnings, and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 52-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 53-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 3a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 54-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 4a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General

OP-2011-0066



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 55-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 5a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

Attorney General

OP-2011-0067



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 56-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 6a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 57-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 7a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings, state sales and use taxes including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, and corporate franchise taxes, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General

OP-2011-0069



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 58-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 8a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 59-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 9a). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and state sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax to include all sales and services to individuals, and allow the legislature to increase this tax up to 7%, with certain exceptions;
- require that low income individuals be given tax rebates or credits for certain purchases; and
- prohibit the legislature from creating, or businesses and individuals from using, certain tax credits?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 23, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 60-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 14, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to reduce the number of members and districts of the Missouri House of Representatives from 163 to 103 beginning with the 2023 General Assembly?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

February 23, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 61-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 14, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Matt Cologna regarding a proposed amendment to amend Chapter 115, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to expand options for voters by allowing them to cast ballots in person prior to federal general elections without the current absentee ballot excuse requirement?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

February 28, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 62-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated February 23, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition, submitted by Theodis Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo 2000.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo 2000.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo 2000, the Secretary of State is authorized

Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2 February 28, 2011

to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 63-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 25, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Local governmental entities estimated savings from this proposal of at least \$7.8 million, but the total potential savings is unknown. It is estimated the proposal would have no cost or savings to state governmental entities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 64-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 25, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Local governmental entities estimated savings from this proposal of at least \$7.8 million, but the total potential savings is unknown. It is estimated the proposal would have no cost or savings to state governmental entities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

ely duly yours.



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 65-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 25, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 4). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Local governmental entities estimated savings from this proposal of at least \$7.8 million, but the total potential savings is unknown. It is estimated the proposal would have no cost or savings to state governmental entities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 66-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 25, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 5). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Local governmental entities estimated savings from this proposal of at least \$7.8 million, but the total potential savings is unknown. It is estimated the proposal would have no cost or savings to state governmental entities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

27 C1 6



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 67-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of February 25, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by James B. Deutsch (version 6). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Local governmental entities estimated savings from this proposal of at least \$7.8 million, but the total potential savings is unknown. It is estimated the proposal would have no cost or savings to state governmental entities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

March 10, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 68-2011

The Honorable Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of March 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis (version 5). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual estimated savings to state government would be at least \$4.7 million. No fiscal impact is expected for local governments.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 10, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 69-2011

Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 3, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 130, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Russell Purvis.

We approve the petition as to form. But § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 70-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 4, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by James B. Deutsch regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 2). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- Require that all municipal police forces or departments be controlled by the municipal governing body where the police force or department is located; and
- Require the governing body of any city whose municipal police force or department was under state control, currently St. Louis and Kansas City, to maintain the terms of any existing pension plan for current or retired officers or employees of such police force or department who were hired prior to November 6, 2012?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we

take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 71-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 4, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by James B. Deutsch regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- Require that all municipal police forces or departments be controlled by the municipal governing body where the police force or department is located; and
- Require the governing body of any city whose municipal police force or department was under state control, currently St. Louis and Kansas City, to maintain the terms of any existing pension plan for current or retired officers or employees of such police force or department who were hired prior to November 6, 2012?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we

Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTEI



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

March 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 72-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 4, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by James B. Deutsch regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 4). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- Require that all municipal police forces or departments be controlled by the municipal governing body where the police force or department is located; and
- Require the governing body of any city whose municipal police force or department was under state control, currently St. Louis and Kansas City, to maintain the terms of any existing pension plan for current or retired officers or employees of such police force or department who were hired prior to November 6, 2012?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we

Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 73-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 4, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by James B. Deutsch regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 5). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- Require that all municipal police forces or departments be controlled by the municipal governing body where the police force or department is located; and
- Require the governing body of any city whose municipal police force or department was under state control, currently St. Louis and Kansas City, to maintain the terms of any existing pension plan for current or retired officers or employees of such police force or department who were hired prior to November 6, 2012?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we

take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 74-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 4, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by James B. Deutsch regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article VI of the Missouri Constitution (version 6). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- Require that all municipal police forces or departments be controlled by the municipal governing body where the police force or department is located; and
- Require the governing body of any city whose municipal police force or department was under state control, currently St. Louis and Kansas City, to maintain the terms of any existing pension plan for current or retired officers or employees of such police force or department who were hired prior to November 6, 2012?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we

take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 75-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 4, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a revised proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to reduce the number of members and districts of the Missouri House of Representatives from 163 to 103 beginning with the 2023 General Assembly?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER

COMPENSATION:
INCREASE IN
COMPENSATION:
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY:
SALARIES FOR
PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE:
SALARY INCREASE:

Under § 56.265, RSMo 2000, a prosecutor in a non-chartered county must be given the same pay increases provided to associate circuit judges, even if it results in a midterm increase in salary, because the increases are provided pursuant to a formula that existed before the prosecutor was elected, and the prosecutor has no power to control the fixing of judicial salaries.

OPINION NO. 76-2011

March 21, 2011

Honorable Dan W. Brown State Senator, District 16 State Capitol, Room 434 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Senator Brown:

This opinion is in response to your request regarding whether the Phelps County Commissioners must comply with § 56.265, RSMo 2000, and pay the prosecutor the same pay increases given to the associate circuit judges in 2007, 2008, and 2009.

The facts you provided state that the Phelps County Commissioners have refused to give the Phelps County Prosecutor the same pay increase given to associate circuit judges, because the commissioners think it is an unconstitutional midterm pay increase. We assume that Phelps County is a non-chartered third-class county.

"Statutes are presumed to be constitutional. Therefore, a statute will not be invalidated unless it clearly and undoubtedly violates some constitutional provision and palpably affronts fundamental law embodied in the constitution." *Ehlmann v. Nixon*, 323 S.W.3d 787, 788 (Mo. banc 2010).

"The seminal rule of statutory construction is to ascertain the intent of the legislature from the language used and to consider the words used in their plain and ordinary meaning." *Turner v. School Dist. of Clayton*, 318 S.W.3d 660, 665 (Mo. banc 2010). "When statutes are clear and unambiguous, courts do not resort to rules of statutory construction." *Ehlmann v. Nixon*, 323 S.W.3d at 790.

Article VII, § 13, Mo. Const., states: "The compensation of state, county and municipal officers shall not be increased during the term of office; nor shall the term of any officer be extended." The purpose of this provision is "to prevent persons while possessed of the prestige and influence of official power from using that power for their own advantage...." State ex rel. Scobee v. Meriwether, 200 S.W.2d 340, 341 (Mo. banc 1947). County prosecuting attorneys are county officers within the meaning of this section because they are elected officials who are delegated state power to prosecute individuals for breaking the law. State ex rel. Webb v. Pigg, 249 S.W.2d 435, 437-38 (Mo. banc 1952) (a person is an officer under this provision if he or she has been delegated some sovereign power to exercise with some continuity within the bounds of the law).

"Despite its plain language, the Constitutional prohibition against midterm increases in compensation is not absolute." Laclede County. v. Douglass, 43 S.W.3d 826, 828 (Mo. banc 2001). There are at least three exceptions to this prohibition: where the increase of pay is due to imposing additional duties on the officer, where no compensation had been authorized before the officer's term began, and where a statutory formula authorizing the midterm salary increases was passed before the officer was elected. Id.; Maxwell v. Daviess County, 190 S.W.3d 606, 612, note 6 (Mo. App. W.D. 2006). The first two exceptions do not apply here. But, if the prosecuting attorney's salary is set by a formula that provides for an annual increase in the salary, then Art. VII, § 13, Mo. Const. is not violated if the prosecutor's salary is increased midterm by operation of the formula.

Generally, the salary of every county officer in a non-chartered county is set by the salary commission of that county, and is fixed for the officer's entire term before that term begins. § 50.333.6, RSMo. But there is a separate statute that controls the prosecutor's salary in non-chartered counties: § 56.265.1(1), RSMo, 2000, which provides that "a full-time prosecutor ... shall receive compensation equal to the compensation of an associate circuit judge." This statute does not contain a formula to compute

the actual dollar amount of the prosecutor's salary. But it does contain the formula: "prosecutor's salary equals associate circuit judge's salary." This declaration satisfies the purpose of Article VII, § 13, Mo. Const., to prevent elected officers from using their influence to vote themselves pay increases, because, as shown below, prosecutors are excluded from having any say in how judicial salaries are computed.

Salaries for judges are computed by the Missouri Citizens' Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials, established by Art. XIII, § 3, Mo. Const.¹ This provision provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

- 1. Other provisions of this constitution to the contrary notwithstanding, in order to ensure that the power to control the rate of compensation of elected officials of this state is retained and exercised by the tax paying citizens of the state, ... no elected state official, member of the general assembly, or judge, except municipal judges, shall receive compensation for the performance of their duties other than in the amount established for each office by the Missouri citizens' commission on compensation for elected officials established pursuant to the provisions of this section. ...
- 8. The commission ... every two years ... shall fix the compensation for each respective position. ... The schedule of compensation shall become effective unless disapproved by concurrent resolution adopted by a two-thirds majority vote the general assembly ... The schedule shall apply and represent the compensation for each affected person beginning on the first day of July following the filing of the schedule.

Art. XIII, § 3, Mo. Const. No prosecutor may serve on the commission while in office, because a prosecutor is an elected official of a political subdivision, and subsection 3 provides: "... no state official, no member of the general

¹ This provision was passed in 1994 and amended in 2006.

assembly, no active judge of any court, no employee of the state or any of its institutions, boards, commissions, agencies or other entities, no elected or appointed official or employee of any political subdivision of the state, and no lobbyist as defined by law shall serve as a member of the commission" (emphasis added). Because prosecutors have no power to control the salary decisions of the Missouri Citizens' Commission, because the Commission controls the salaries of judges, and because the prosecutor's salaries are equal to the salaries of associate circuit judges, the purposes of Art. VII, § 13, Mo. Const., are met.

Further, because Art. XIII, § 3, Mo. Const., begins with the phrase, "Other provisions of this constitution to the contrary notwithstanding," to the extent Art. VII, § 13, Mo. Const., conflicts with this section, this section controls. Weinstock v. Holden, 995 S.W.2d 411, 410 (Mo. banc 1999).² Therefore, if the legislature allows the Commission's salary recommendations to take effect, those recommendations are effective whether or not a state office, legislator, or judge is beginning a new term or in the midst of a term.

A prosecutor does not seem to be considered an "elected state official" within the meaning of Art. XIII, § 3, Mo. Const.—even though prosecutors are elected, represent the State of Missouri, and have power delegated by the State to prosecute those who violate state laws—because their power is not coextensive with the geographic boundaries of the state of Missouri, only with the particular county in which they were elected. See Missouri Prosecuting Attorneys v. Barton County, 311 S.W.3d 737, 747, 752 (Mo. banc 2010) (majority and one dissenting opinion consider prosecutors to be "county officers" under Mo. Const. Art. VI, § 13); Weinstock v. Holden, 995 S.W.2d at 414, Appendix G, RSMo Cum. Supp. 2009 (listing salary for "statewide" officials), State ex rel. Webb v. Pigg, 249 S.W.2d at 437-38 (defining state official). Therefore, the Commission does not directly set their salaries, and the provision that allows the Commission to raise salaries midterm does not directly apply to prosecutors. Also, § 56.265, RSMo 2000, cannot, by itself,

² Art. XIII, § 3, Mo. Const., was also passed almost 120 years later and is more specific than Art. VII, § 13, Mo. Const., so it would control over that section in any event. South Metropolitan Fire Protection Dist. v. City of Lee's Summit, 278 S.W.3d 659, 666 (Mo. banc 2009) (where two provisions conflict, latter statute is considered an exception to the earlier provision); Turner v. School Dist. of Clayton, 318 S.W.3d at 668 (where provisions conflict, specific provision prevails over general provision).

give prosecutor's midterm salary increases, because it is only a statute, and therefore cannot overcome the constitutional prohibition against midterm salary increases in Art. VII, § 13, Mo. Const. However, because the statute has a formula that equates prosecutor's salaries with judicial salaries, and because, as shown above, prosecutors cannot use their position to increase their salaries, giving prosecutors a midterm salary increase pursuant to § 56.265, RSMo 2000, is permissible under Art. VII, § 13, Mo. Const. See State ex rel. Scobee v. Meriwether, 200 S.W.2d at 341.

CONCLUSION

Under § 56.265, RSMo 2000, a prosecutor in a non-chartered county must be given the same pay increases provided to associate circuit judges, even if it results in a midterm increase in salary, because the increases are provided pursuant to a formula that existed before the prosecutor was elected, and the prosecutor has no power to control the fixing of judicial salaries.

W. K.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 31, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 77-2011

Auditor Thomas Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of March 23, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Russell Purvis. The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated this proposal will increase state government costs by at least \$127,000 annually and result in one-time costs of about \$28,000. Any potential impact to state government revenue could not be determined. It is estimated this proposal will have no costs or savings to local governments.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

March 31, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 78-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated March 24, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Russell C. Purvis regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Chapter 130, Revised Statutes of Missouri. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to limit the amount of contributions that may be accepted by any candidate for state or local office to \$5,000 or less per election from any individual or entity, other than the candidate, and establish penalties for violations?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 22, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 79-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 12, 2011 for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Anne Adams (version 1).

We approve the petition as to form. But § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 22, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 80-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 12, 2011 for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution, submitted by Anne Adams (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form. But § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER

Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

April 22, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 81-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated April 12, 2011 for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 590 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri, submitted by Michael Moore.

We approve the petition as to form. But § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER

Attorney General



Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 82-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of May 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 1). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 83-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of May 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 84-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of May 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Michael Moore. The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Compliance with this proposal may result in state and local law enforcement agencies purchasing/upgrading computer software or purchasing cameras for law enforcement vehicles. Those costs will vary by agency based on prior expenditures for these items and compliance decisions made.

Under § 116.175, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 85-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your revised request dated May 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 1). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

May 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 86-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your revised request dated May 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 2). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 87-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 5, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Michael Moore regarding a proposed statutory amendment to amend Chapter 590, Revised Statutes of Missouri. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to require law enforcement agencies to take steps to prevent racial profiling that include implementing a complaint process, requiring corrective action for violators, and providing certain information about traffic or pedestrian stops to the Attorney General for an annual report to the Governor, legislature and law enforcement agencies?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 20, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 88-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 13, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Marc Ellinger.

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 31, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 89-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 20, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Anne Adams (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 31, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 90-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 20, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Anne Adams (version 4).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899

May 31, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 91-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 20, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Anne Adams (version 5).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

· // // // //

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

May 31, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 92-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 20, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Anne Adams (version 6).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 3, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 93-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 27, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Anne Adams (version 7).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 3, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 94-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated May 27, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Anne Adams (version 8).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 10, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 95-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger. The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Estimated additional revenue to state government from this proposal is \$20 million to \$100 million annually with limited estimated implementation costs. The revenue will fund only programs and actions allowed by the proposal. No costs or savings are expected for local governments. Any possible change in revenue for local governments is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (578) 751-3321

June 10, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 96-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 2, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Chapter 149, RSMo. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to require an additional tax of \$1.00 on each package of twenty cigarettes produced by certain tobacco product manufacturers, which tax shall be paid by wholesalers and used solely for tobacco education and cessation programs and for enforcement and administration of the Master Settlement Agreement by the Missouri Attorney General?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 97-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of June 8, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 98-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 8, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 4). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 99-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 8, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 5). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 100-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 8, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 6). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 101-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 8, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER

Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 102-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 10, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 103-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 10, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 4). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 104-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 10, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 5). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 105-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 10, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 6). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 17, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 106-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 14, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 23, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 107-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

You have submitted a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared pursuant to § 116.175, RSMo, concerning a proposed constitutional amendment passed by the Missouri General Assembly (House Committee Substitute No. 2 for Senate Joint Resolution No. 2). The fiscal note summary which you submitted is as follows:

Direct costs to state governmental entities and costs reimbursed by the state to local election authorities are estimated to be at least \$3 million to \$6.5 million annually. Those costs may be higher depending on the compensation, staffing, public notification and planning decisions of election authorities with the total annual costs being unknown.

Pursuant to § 116.175, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Since our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the Senate Joint Resolution or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 23, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 108-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

You have submitted a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared pursuant to § 116.175, RSMo, concerning a proposed constitutional amendment passed by the Missouri General Assembly (House Joint Resolution No. 2). The fiscal note summary which you submitted is as follows:

It is estimated this proposal will result in little or no costs or savings for state and local governmental entities.

Pursuant to § 116.175, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Since our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the House Joint Resolution or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 109-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 15, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 7). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTEI



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 110-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of June 15, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Anne Adams (version 8). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

The proposal is estimated to result in no direct costs or savings to state and local governmental entities.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 111-2011

Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

You have submitted a proposed fair ballot language statement for the initiative petition submitted by the General Assembly relating to elections. The fair ballot language statement, prepared pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, is as follows:

A "yes" vote will amend the Missouri Constitution to allow the General Assembly to provide by general law for advance voting in person prior to election day, restrictions on the forms of permissible voter identification which may include requiring valid government-issued photo identification, and voter requirements based on whether one appears to vote in person or by absentee ballot.

A "no" vote will not change the current constitutional provisions regarding elections.

If passed, this measure will have no impact on taxes.

Pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed fair ballot language statement.

Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Because our review of the fair ballot language statement is mandated by statute, no action we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the joint resolution, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 112-2011

Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

You have submitted a proposed fair ballot language statement for the initiative petition submitted by the General Assembly relating to the right to pray. The fair ballot language statement, prepared pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, is as follows:

A "yes" vote will amend the Missouri Constitution to provide that neither the state nor political subdivisions shall establish any official religion. The amendment further provides that a citizen's right to express their religious beliefs regardless of their religion shall not be infringed and that the right to worship includes prayer in private or public settings, on government premises, on public property, and in all public schools. The amendment also requires public schools to display the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution.

A "no" vote will not change the current constitutional provisions protecting freedom of religion.

If passed, this measure will have no impact on taxes.

Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.025, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed fair ballot language statement.

Because our review of the fair ballot language statement is mandated by statute, no action we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the joint resolution, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 113-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 7). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

June 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 114-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated June 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Anne Adams regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article III of the Missouri Constitution (version 8). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to prohibit the repeal or amendment by the General Assembly of a statute enacted by citizen initiative passed by the voters of Missouri, except by either a three-fourths vote of the members of each house or a vote of the people through a referendum or unless such statute explicitly provides that the general assembly may repeal or amend it by a majority vote of the members of each house?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



65102

JEFFERSON CITY CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 18, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 115-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 8, 2011, for our review under § 116.332. RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 367 and 408. Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by James Bryan (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

July 25, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 116-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 14, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Kyle Neale.

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 5, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 117-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of July 28, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by James Bryan (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State governmental entities could have annual lost revenue estimated at \$2.5 to \$3.5 million that could be partially offset by expenditure reductions for monitoring industry compliance. Local governmental entities could have unknown total lost revenue related to business license or other business operating fees if the proposal results in business closures.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 5, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 118-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 1, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 8, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 119-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated July 29, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by James Bryan regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to limit the annual rate of interest, fees, and finance charges for payday, title, installment, and consumer credit loans and prohibit such lenders from using other transactions to avoid the rate limit?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 120-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your revised letter of August 11, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Kyle Neale, (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Estimated lost revenue to state and local governmental entities resulting from this proposal's elimination of payment of taxes and fees for certain businesses would be significant (millions of dollars) with the total potential lost revenue being unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 15, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 121-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 5, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Kyle Neale regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 367 and 408, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to prohibit state or local governments from imposing any fee for doing business in Missouri on payday, title, installment, and consumer credit lenders and from imposing any taxes on such lenders?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 122-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 10).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

August 24, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 123-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated August 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 11).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER

Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 124-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 2, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 10). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax on all sales and services, and allow the legislature to increase taxes up to 5½% on purchases of food and 7% on other sales and services, with certain exceptions;
- require that state and local cumulative sales tax rate not exceed 10%, with certain exceptions; and

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

• provide for a real property tax credit for eligible homeowners?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 125-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 2, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 11). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax on all sales and services, and allow the legislature to increase taxes up to 5½% on purchases of food and 7% on other sales and services, with certain exceptions; and
- require that state and local cumulative sales tax rate not exceed 10%, with certain exceptions?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 126-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 2, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets (version 2).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 127-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 2, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets (version 2).

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 128-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 2, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 129-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of September 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 10). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government revenue under this proposal may increase by up to \$300 million, or decrease by up to \$1.5 billion. The proposal is estimated to increase state operating costs by at least \$15 million, and may accelerate tax credit redemptions. The fiscal impact to local governments is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (578) 751-3321

September 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 130-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of September 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 11). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government revenue under this proposal may increase by up to \$300 million, or decrease by up to \$1.5 billion. The proposal is estimated to increase state operating costs by at least \$15 million, and may accelerate tax credit redemptions. The fiscal impact to local governments is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O.Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 131-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 12).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,
CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 16, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 132-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 6, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 13).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 26, 2011.

OPINION LETTER NO. 133-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Herman Kriegshauser.

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

September 29, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 134-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 20, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Robert Hess.

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 5, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 135-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of September 26, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 12). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government revenue under this proposal may increase by up to \$300 million, or decrease by up to \$1.5 billion. The proposal is estimated to increase state operating costs by at least \$12.8 million, and may accelerate tax credit redemptions. The fiscal impact to local governments is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 5, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 136-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of September 26, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 13). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government revenue under this proposal may increase by up to \$300 million, or decrease by up to \$1.5 billion. The proposal is estimated to increase state operating costs by at least \$12.9 million, and may accelerate tax credit redemptions. The fiscal impact to local governments is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

(573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 5, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 137-2011

P.O. Box 899

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 27, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 138-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 29, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 12). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax on all sales and services, and allow the legislature to increase taxes up to 5½% on purchases of food and 7% on other sales and services, with certain exceptions; and
- require that state and local cumulative sales tax rate not exceed 10%, with certain exceptions?

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

. .

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 11, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 139-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated September 29, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 13). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- eliminate taxes paid by individuals based on income or earnings and sales and use taxes, including taxes paid by corporations and individuals, with certain exceptions;
- require the legislature to impose an expanded state sales tax on all sales and services, and allow the legislature to increase taxes up to 5½% on purchases of food and 7% on other sales and services, with certain exceptions;
- require that state and local cumulative sales tax rate not exceed 10%, with certain exceptions; and

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

• provide for a real property tax credit for eligible homeowners?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 140-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 3, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Dan Viets (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 13, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 141-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 3, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 105, 195, and 263, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Dan Viets (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 14, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 142-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of October 4, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser. The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government revenue may decrease by an estimated \$244 million. The proposal is estimated to increase state operating costs by at least \$80,000. Reduced state revenue could result in decreased state funding for local governments and public education entities. Public education entities could have an unknown increase in donation revenue.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 14, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 143-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 5, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Christopher Grant (version 1).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 14, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 144-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 5, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Christopher Grant (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 14, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 145-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 7, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Herman Kriegshauser regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to provide a Missouri state income tax credit of 60% of the amount of contributions or donations made by individuals and corporations to Missouri public schools, higher education colleges and universities, and incorporated and operated educational not-for-profit corporations, organizations, institutions and foundations, in addition to the deductions currently allowed to the contributor or donor for their federal and state income taxes, with certain exceptions?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 14, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 146-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of October 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess. The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Estimated additional revenue to state government from this proposal is \$308 million to \$487 million annually with limited estimated implementation costs or savings. The revenue will fund only programs and services allowed by the proposal. Local governmental fiscal impact is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 21, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 147-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 13, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Robert Hess regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- create the Health and Education Trust Fund with the proceeds of a tax of four cents per cigarette and thirty-four percent of the manufacturer's invoice price for other tobacco products;
- use the proceeds of the Fund to reduce and prevent tobacco use and for elementary, secondary, college, and university public school funding; and
- increase the amount that certain tobacco product manufacturers must maintain in their escrow

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

> accounts, to pay judgments or settlements, before any funds in escrow can be refunded to the tobacco product manufacturer?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 28, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 148-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of October 21, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government operating costs would increase by at least \$1 million with the total increase being unknown. Those costs would be offset by an unknown increase in fee and tax revenues. The fiscal impact to local governmental entities is unknown with some increase in revenue possible.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

October 28, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 149-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of October 21, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Dan Viets (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Annual state government operating costs would increase by at least \$1 million with the total increase being unknown. Those costs would be offset by an unknown increase in fee and tax revenues. The fiscal impact to local governmental entities is unknown with some increase in revenue possible.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 150-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of October 25, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Christopher Grant (version 1). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Increased state and local government wage and benefit costs resulting from this proposal will exceed \$1 million annually. State government income and sales tax revenue could increase by an estimated \$14.4 million annually; however, business employment decisions will impact any potential change in revenue. Local government revenue will change by an unknown amount.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Page 2

be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 151-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of October 25, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Christopher Grant (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Increased state and local government wage and benefit costs resulting from this proposal will exceed \$1 million annually. State government income and sales tax revenue could increase by an estimated \$14.4 million annually; however, business employment decisions will impact any potential change in revenue. Local government revenue will change by an unknown amount.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Page 2

be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 152-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 27, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Dan Viets regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article IV of the Missouri Constitution (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- legalize cannabis (commonly known as marijuana) for individuals 21 years or older;
- make medical cannabis available to individuals with a physician's recommendation including those under 21 with parental or legal guardian consent and physician supervision;
- create licensing processes for operation of cannabis establishments;
- release individuals incarcerated or on probation or parole for non-violent, cannabis-only offenses

which would no longer be illegal and expunge all records related to such offenses; and

• allow the legislature to enact a tax on the retail sale of dried cannabis up to \$100 per pound?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 7, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 153-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This Revised opinion letter responds to your request dated October 27, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Dan Viets regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 105, 195, and 263, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- legalize cannabis (commonly known as marijuana) for individuals 21 years or older;
- make medical cannabis available to individuals with a physician's recommendation including those under 21 with parental or legal guardian consent and physician supervision;
- create licensing processes for operation of cannabis establishments;
- release individuals incarcerated or on probation or parole for non-violent, cannabis-only offenses

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

which would no longer be illegal and expunge all records related to such offenses; and

• allow the legislature to enact a tax on the retail sale of dried cannabis up to \$100 per pound?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 154-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 27, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Christopher N. Grant regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 1). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- increase the state minimum wage to \$8.25 per hour, or to the federal minimum wage if that is higher, and adjust the state wage annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index;
- increase the minimum wage for employees who receive tips to 60% of the state minimum wage; and
- modify certain other provisions of the minimum wage law including the retail or service

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

businesses exemption and penalties for paying employees less than the minimum wage?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 4, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 155-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated October 27, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Christopher N. Grant regarding a proposed amendment to Chapter 290, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 2). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- increase the state minimum wage to \$8.25 per hour, or to the federal minimum wage if that is higher, and adjust the state wage annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index;
- increase the minimum wage for employees who receive tips to 60% of the state minimum wage; and
- modify certain other provisions of the minimum wage law including the retail or service

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

businesses exemption and penalties for paying employees less than the minimum wage?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 25, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 156-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 14, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Kenny Newhouse.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 25, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 157-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 14, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 84, 86, and 105, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 7).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

November 28, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 158-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 18, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Robert Hess.

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 159-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 1).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 160-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 161-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 162-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 4).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 163-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 5).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 164-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 6).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 165-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 7).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 2, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 166-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 22, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 8).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

ATTORNEY GENERAL

CHRIS KOSTER

December 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 167-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated November 30, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition submitted by Theodis Brown.

We conclude that the petition must be rejected for at least the following reasons:

- 1. The petition is not in the form prescribed by § 116.040, RSMo.
- 2. The petition does not contain "all matter which is to be deleted included in its proper place enclosed in brackets and all new matter shown underlined" as required pursuant to § 116.050, RSMo.

Because of our rejection of the form of the petition for the reasons stated above, we have not reviewed the petition to determine if additional deficiencies exist. Pursuant to § 116.332.3, RSMo, the Secretary of State is authorized to review this opinion and "make a final decision as to the approval or rejection of the form of the petition."

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 168-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 1, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution submitted by Mark Reading (version 9).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 12, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 169-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 2, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Marc Ellinger (version 7). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

State governmental entities estimated savings will eventually be up to \$500,000 annually. Local governmental entities estimated annual potential savings of \$3.5 million; however, consolidation decisions with an unknown outcome may result in the savings being more or less than estimated.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 170-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 7, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Robert Hess (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER Attorney General



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 171-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 7, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Robert Hess. The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

Estimated additional revenue to state government from this proposal is \$283 million to \$423 million annually with limited estimated implementation costs or savings. The revenue will fund only programs and services allowed by the proposal. The fiscal impact to local governmental entities is unknown.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 172-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO. 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 8, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Marc Ellinger regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 84, 86, and 105, Revised Statutes of Missouri (version 7). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- allow any city not within a county (the City of St. Louis) the option of transferring certain obligations and control of the city's police force from the board of police commissioners currently appointed by the governor to the city and establishing a municipal police force;
- establish certain procedures and requirements for governing such a municipal police force including residency, rank, salary, benefits, insurance, and pension; and

• prohibit retaliation against any employee of such municipal police force who reports conduct believed to be illegal to a superior, government agency, or the press?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER . ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 173-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 9, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Mark Reading (version 1).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 174-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 9, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Mark Reading (version 2).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 175-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 9, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapter 149, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Mark Reading (version 3).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 176-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 9, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Mark Reading (version 4).

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General



Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 177-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 9, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Robert Hess regarding a proposed amendment to Chapters 149 and 196, Revised Statutes of Missouri. The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall Missouri law be amended to:

- create the Health and Education Trust Fund with proceeds of a tax of \$0.0365 per cigarette and 25% of the manufacturer's invoice price for roll-your-own tobacco and 15% for other tobacco products;
- use Fund proceeds to reduce and prevent tobacco use and for elementary, secondary, college, and university public school funding; and
- increase the amount that certain tobacco product manufacturers must maintain in their escrow accounts, to pay judgments or settlements, before any funds in escrow can be refunded to the

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

tobacco product manufacturer and create bonding requirements for these manufacturers?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 178-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 1). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 179-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 2). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



Attorney General of Missouri

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 180-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 3). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



65102

JEFFERSON CITY

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 181-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 4). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

> This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 182-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 5). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 183-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 6). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 184-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 7). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 19, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 185-2011

The Honorable Thomas A. Schweich Missouri State Auditor State Capitol, Room 121 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Auditor Schweich:

This office received your letter of December 9, 2011, submitting a fiscal note and fiscal note summary prepared under § 116.175, RSMo, for an initiative petition submitted by Mark Reading (version 8). The fiscal note summary that you submitted is as follows:

This proposal has no fiscal impact (change in costs, savings, or revenues) for state and local governmental entities as it will only enact enabling legislation allowing the establishment of local tobacco taxes that may or may not be submitted to and approved by voters.

Under § 116.175.4, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the fiscal note summary. Because our review of the fiscal note summary is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the initiative petition or as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 186-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 1). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- allow voters in cities and counties to set and control local taxes on cigarettes or tobacco products within their city or county; and
- use the proceeds of such taxes for local job creation, health care, public education, reduction and prevention of tobacco use, or other uses specifically approved by local voters?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 187-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 2). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- allow voters in cities and counties to set and control local taxes on cigarettes or tobacco products within their city or county; and
- use the proceeds of such taxes for local job creation, health care, public education, reduction and prevention of tobacco use, or other uses specifically approved by local voters?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 188-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 3). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to:

- allow voters in counties and the City of St. Louis to set and control local taxes on cigarettes or tobacco products within their county or city; and
- use the proceeds of such taxes for local job creation, health care, public education, reduction and prevention of tobacco use, or other uses specifically approved by such local voters?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Page 2

as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER
Attorney General



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 189-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

CHRIS KOSTER

ATTORNEY GENERAL

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 5). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow voters in cities and counties to set and control local taxes on cigarettes or tobacco products within their city or county?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



JEFFERSON CITY 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 190-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 6). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow voters in cities and counties to set and control local taxes on cigarettes or tobacco products within their city or county?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 191-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 7). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow voters in counties and the City of St. Louis to set and control local taxes on cigarettes or tobacco products within their county or city?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS KOSTER



65102

JEFFERSON CITY

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 192-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 15, 2011, for our review under § 116.334, RSMo, of a proposed summary statement prepared for the petition submitted by Mark Reading regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to amend Article X of the Missouri Constitution (version 8). The proposed summary statement is as follows:

> Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to allow voters in counties and the City of St. Louis to set and control local taxes on cigarettes or tobacco products within their county or city?

Pursuant to § 116.334, RSMo, we approve the legal content and form of the proposed statement. Because our review of the statement is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition, nor as the expression of any view regarding the objectives of its proponents.

Very truly yours

CHRIS KOSTER



Jefferson City 65102

P.O. Box 899 (573) 751-3321

CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

December 27, 2011

OPINION LETTER NO. 193-2011

The Honorable Robin Carnahan Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick State Information Center 600 West Main Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Secretary Carnahan:

This opinion letter responds to your request dated December 16, 2011, for our review under § 116.332, RSMo, of the sufficiency as to form of an initiative petition to amend Chapters 393 and 386, Revised Statutes of Missouri submitted by Paul C. Wilson.

We approve the petition as to form, but § 116.332 gives the Secretary of State final authority to approve or reject the petition. Therefore, our approval of the form of the petition does not preclude you from rejecting the petition.

Because our review of the petition is simply for the purpose of determining sufficiency as to form, the fact that we do not reject the petition is not to be construed as a determination that the petition is sufficient as to substance. Likewise, because our review is mandated by statute, no action that we take with respect to such review should be construed as an endorsement of the petition or of the objectives of its proponents, or the expression of any view respecting the adequacy or inadequacy of the petition generally.

Very truly yours.

CHRIS KOSTER